REMARKS

Applicants have amended claims 15, 33, 41, and 47. No new matter has been added by this amendment.

Applicant acknowledges that claims 5-14, 19-20, 28-32, 37, 40, 43, 46, and 49 have been identified by the Examiner as allowable subject matter, but are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-4, 15-18, 21-27, 33-36, 38-39, 41-42, 44-45, and 47-48 under 35 U.S.C §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gilhousen et al. (U.S. Patent 4,613,901) in view of Tatebayashi (U.S. Patent 6,654,883).

Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references fail to teach or render obvious Applicant's invention as claimed in claims 1-4, 15-18, 21-27, 33-36, 38-39, 41-42, 44-45, and 47-48.

Gilhousen et al. discloses a system and method for scrambling and selectively descrambling television signals that are transmitted to subscribers' descramblers. Gilhousen et al. illustrates in Figure 1 an audio and video stream entering a scrambler signal processor, which then scrambles the signals in accordance with a unique keystream. (Col. 6, lines 8-13) The scrambled television signal is sent on line 47 to the descrambler signal processor. (Fig. 1, Fig. 5, Col. 12, lines 17-28) Gilhousen et al. does not teach a video source application. Gilhousen et al. discloses only video stream 45 and audio stream 46 entering a scrambler signal processor 10. (Fig. 1) Gilhousen et al. does not teach a source of the video stream or the audio stream. Moreover, Gilhousen et al. does not teach a video source application requesting from a video hardware interface status with respect to a link linking said video source device to an external video sink device. Nor does Gilhousen et al. teach a video source application requesting from a video hardware interface a secret employed by said video hardware interface to cipher video to be transmitted by said video hardware interface to an external video sink device.

Tatebayashi discloses a device authentication and encrypted communication system comprising an onboard device 1200 and a roadside device 1300 used for toll collection. (Fig. 3) Tatebayashi does not teach a video source application, nor does Tatebayashi teach a video source application requesting from a video hardware interface status with respect to a link linking said video source device to an external video sink device.

Regarding independent claims 1, 21, 38, and 44, Applicant teaches and claims: in a video source device, a video source application requesting from a video hardware interface status with respect to a link linking said video source device to an external video sink device, and supplementing said status request with a first basis value to a symmetric ciphering/deciphering process; the video source application receiving from said video hardware interface said requested status and a verification key, generated through said symmetric ciphering/deciphering process employing said first basis value; and the video source application verifying the correctness of said verification key to determine whether to trust said provided status.

Applicant teaches that the video source application generates and provides video content to the video hardware interface, which in turn ciphers video content and provides the video content in ciphered form to a video sink device through a digital video link. (Page 5, lines 22-24). The video source application may request from the video hardware interface status information about the link between the video hardware interface and the video sink device. (Page 5, lines 25-26; page 6, lines 1-2; and figs. 1 and 2a) The video

hardware interface may provide the status information to the video source application in a protected manner. (Page 6, lines 6-8)

Neither Gilhousen et al. nor Tatebayashi teach a video source application. Furthermore, neither Gilhousen et al. nor Tatebayashi teach a video source application requesting from a video hardware interface status with respect to a link linking said video source device to an external video sink device. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 21, 38, and 44 are not rendered obvious by Gilhousen et al. or Tatebayashi, individually or in combination, because these references do not teach or suggest each and every element of these claims.

Claims 2-14, 22-32, 39-40, and 45-46 are dependent upon claims 1, 21, 38, and 44, respectively. Thus, for at least the same reasons advanced above with respect to independent claims 1, 10, 21, 36, and 42, Applicant respectfully submits that neither Gilhousen et al. nor Tatebayashi individually or in combination, render these claims obvious.

Regarding independent claims 15, 33, 41, and 47, Applicant teaches and claims: in a video source device, a video source application requesting from a video hardware interface a secret employed by said video hardware interface to cipher video to be transmitted by said video hardware interface to an external video sink device, and supplementing said secret request with a basis value to said a symmetric ciphering/deciphering process between said video source application and said video hardware interface; the video source application receiving from said video hardware interface said requested secret in a ciphered form, having been ciphered using a ciphering

key generated using said symmetric ciphering/deciphering process and employing said basis value; and the video source application deciphering said ciphered secret using an independently generated copy of said ciphering key.

As set forth above, neither Gilhousen et al. nor Tatebayashi teach a video source application. Moreover, neither Gilhousen et al. nor Tatebayashi teach a video source application requesting from a video hardware interface a secret employed by said video hardware interface to cipher video to be transmitted by said video hardware interface to an external video sink device. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 15, 33, 41, and 47 are not rendered obvious by Gilhousen et al. or Tatebayashi, individually or in combination, because these references do not teach or suggest each and every element of these claims.

Claims 16-20, 34-37, 42-43, and 48-49 are dependent upon claims 15, 33, 41, and 47, respectively. Thus, for at least the same reasons advanced above with respect to independent claims 15, 33, 41, and 47, Applicant respectfully submits that neither Gilhousen et al. nor Tatebayashi individually or in combination, render these claims obvious.

Applicant respectfully requests the removal of the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of claims 1-4, 15-18, 21-27, 33-36, 38-39, 41-42, 44-45, and 47-48, and removal of the objection to claims 5-14, 19-20, 28-32, 37, 40, 43, 46, and 49 and requests an allowance of these claims.

If there are any additional charges, please charge Deposit Account No 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: 4/30/ 2004

James H. Salter
Reg. No. 35,668

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(408) 720-8300